THE

BOSTON MEDICAL AND SURGICAL JOURNAL.

VOL. XXIII. WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1840. No. 12.

DR. PAINE'S REPLY TO H. I. B.

To the Editor of the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal.

SIR,—You will much oblige me by publishing the following reply to the attack upon my Essay on the Principal Writings of P. Ch. A. Louis, M.D., which appeared in your Journal on the 9th, 16th and 23d of September, purporting to have been written by "H. I. B." I have divided my communication into several parts, so that it may interfere as little as possible with the rights of other correspondents.

New York, Oct. 4th, 1840. Very respectfully yours,

THE AUTHOR OF THE MEDICAL AND PHYSIOLOGICAL COMMENTARIES.

No. I.

I am sensible that it is a good rule for an author to leave his work to the justice of the world, which never fails to discover its motives and its merits, whilst it holds in the same balance those of his critics. But, it has been the destiny of my book to have met with an unusual adversary before it can have had the advantage of any general perusal; whose purpose has been to impede its circulation by misrepresenting specifically my Essay on the "Principal Writings of M. Louis," and the objects of the work in a general sense. I am, therefore, induced to depart from my views of expediency under ordinary circumstances, and to protect myself against the misstatements of "H. I. B.," till the public may take the work into its own charge.

Having, then, undertaken my own defence, I shall notice every point of attack, *in extenso*, that the work may be neither imperfectly done, nor my neglect of any objection be construed into an admission of its correctness. But, more than myself, I have in view a defence of the Essay which is the special subject of assault, since it relates to some momentous questions in medical science.

It is painful to me in performing this act of justice, that I am compelled to touch upon the morals of another, or to employ any language of recrimination. It is more especially so to recur to a task which I assumed in relation to the writings of M. Louis, and which was undertaken solely in behalf of my profession, and of that general experience of the world upon which my work is founded. But, having determined not to remain silent, I must be efficient. My whole position in respect to M. Louis being susceptible of entire defence, it must not be neglected from any indisposition to renew the subject. I will endeavor, however,

to avoid the expedient of my critic in substituting fraud and personalities for fact and argument. It was doubtless thought that the former would deter me from any collision with him; and here my assailant would have calculated rightly, had he not overstepped the mark as to my honor and veracity.

It may be assumed that "H. I. B." has made the best of his cause, not only for an important reason yet to be assigned, but from his declaration that "we are devoted lovers of the plan originally proposed by others, but first fully developed by Louis, viz., the Numerical Method. We hereby give in our faith," &c. Should it appear, therefore, that "H. I. B.," actuated, also, by the lowest motives, has utterly failed in all his points of attack, the work which he assails will be fairly entitled to the consideration of having placed certain dangerous innovations upon philosophical and practical medicine in such an aspect as to defy their most interested advocates. The public, therefore, will perceive that it is deeply interested in this matter; and in proportion to the intrinsic importance of a subject, is ever its disposition to sustain the advocate of truth,—and especially so, where it is apparent that he has had at heart the well being, alone, of his fellow man. But, I ask for no sympathies. My defence looks only to simple justice, and at questions in which the medical public is as much interested as myself. It is therefore especially upon this principle that I expect a patient hearing, and an impartial verdict. If that verdict be my exoneration, it will then appear that I have been hitherto employed in endeavoring to advocate the cause of truth, the violated dignity of the profession, and the desecrated worth of its illustrious founders and of those devoted men who have carried the science of medicine to its present high advancement. In the Essay in question I have endeavored to turn aside the scorpion lash, and here, as elsewhere, to rescue medicine from its imputed "infancy," and to place it where it belongs, in virtue of its wide range of observation and surmounted difficulties, at the head of all human pursuits. This is its rank,—not because of its abstract importance to the necessities and the happiness of mankind, but because no other science was so early cultivated with zeal; no other whose foundation was originally laid in the Baconian philosophy; no other to which that philosophy has been almost uninterruptedly applied for more than two thousand years; no other upon which the efforts of genius have been so largely and powerfully concentrated; no other which swallows up all other science; no other which has left so little for the labors of posterity. I speak of its proper attributes,—not as they are illustrated by ignorance or speculation, or as they are misrepresented by ambition or honest credulity.

I shall have little to say of the style and temper of my reviewer. They carry their own elements of interpretation; and, whilst they seem to denote an unexpected calamity, they have probably rendered sufficiently suspicious the pretences which they were designed to enforce. I come, therefore, at once, to the subject matter of *complaint*. In the first place, however, I would say that, "H. I. B.," the author of the strictures under examination, having impugned my veracity, should have had the magnanimity to have written without disguise. The ini-

tial signature, although sufficiently indicative to many of the authorship, is concealment to most, and may be soon unknown. It serves, however, as a pretext for open avowal should the strictures remain unnoticed, and as a loop-hole of escape should a merited exposure be made. I shall therefore place the authorship upon a ground that shall be intelligible to all, and that no innocent man may be unjustly suspected. I assume, then, that "H. I. B." is Doctor Henry I. Bowditch, the Translator of Louis on Typhoid Fever, who also "revised and altered" Cowan's translation of Louis on Phthisis, and who is or was the copyright proprietor of the American editions of those works. The ground of my conclusion as to the identity of the writer is the initial signature to the review, its appropriation by Dr. Bowditch in his notes to the foregoing works, its remaining uncontradicted, its undoubted import by others, and the internal proofs which abound in the article.

Dr. B. professedly undertakes the defence of M. Louis. After saying that he has "no fears for the foundation of Louis's main ideas,"* he continues,—"Still we feel unwilling to allow any writer, under the pretence of examining the philosophical views of M. Louis, to traduce his character. If all that is said by Dr. Paine of the former physician of La Pitié be true, M. Louis deserves to be treated not merely as one wholly unworthy of confidence in medicine, but as an individual of a base private character."—(P. 73.) And farther on he repeats, "Dr. Paine attempts to prove Louis a liar (we are aware of the meaning of the word), by quoting a translation."—(P. 80.) Here, then, Dr. B. has unnecessarily magnified the inductions which I had drawn, and perverted my Essay to the injury of his friend, since I certainly neither expressed nor entertained such an opinion; and the best evidence which I can offer of my reliance upon his veracity is to be found in the unhesitating manner in which I have received all his statements. This confidence in his veracity appears, also, repeatedly in other Essays, where I have ever quoted his facts and opinions as substantial authority. (See Vol. 1, pp. 314, 408, 533; Vol. 2, pp. 320, 626, 629, 632, &c.) And when employed in repelling his imputation of duplicity and falsehood to venerated members of the profession, I have not retorted the allegation, except in a suppositious manner to show the unhappy results of discrediting medical testimony. (See Vol. 1, pp. 295, 331—332; Vol. 2, p. 680—681.) We have constant examples before us, and around us, where ambition so far saps the moral principle as to render it careless of public rights; but where, also, it is restrained in respect to those private virtues which form the important cement of society. Shall we, for instance, pronounce the politician a "liar," and of "a base private character," because he disregards the public weal to carry the objects of party, or even to advance the aim of selfish ambition? It is exactly in the foregoing respect that I have considered M. Louis,—publicly wrong, but probably amiable in private life. This is one of

* The introductory part of Dr. B.'s attack is a common resche of what appears in Cowan's Preface to the work on Phthisis, in relation to Broussais's *Examen*. "Whilst thus deprecating," says Cowan, "the tone of prejudiced and illiberal feeling which pervades the strictures of M. B——, we *are not anxious about their effects* on the volume before us," &c. The notice, however, is respectful, notwithstanding Broussais "has alternately impeached the accuracy and *veracity* of M. Louis."—(P. 59.)

the paradoxes of human nature, which could not be inferred à *priori*, but which is revealed through daily experience. However unhappy this system of morals, the broad limits exist as I have represented them; though it be certainly true that the barrier is easily passed, and the distinction obliterated.

What I have said of M. Louis's ambition as a public man, of his diplomatic expedients, of the rights he has invaded, of the characters he has assailed, of the degradation to which he would reduce the profession, is predicated of premises which are before the world, in the language of my author. That world, and not an interested partizan, must be my judge. And now, to do the fullest justice to all, I may say that one of my author's judicious friends and defenders, in a late notice of my Essay, does not intimate that I had questioned his veracity, and allows my "general fairness and candor."*

But, what is most extraordinary, is the affirmation, that, "Dr. Paine attempts to prove Louis a liar *by quoting a translation*; whereas, if he had taken the trouble to look at the original, he would have found that he by no means could prove what he wished."—(P. 80.) Now Dr. Bowditch being the author of that translation must certainly take the imputed blame to himself. Least of all should he put forth his own version as the ground of his author's error, and by thus repudiating it, endeavor to show that through his own inaccuracy he had led a confiding man to do an act of the highest injustice to another, and then turn upon him as a calumniator. It will be seen, also, that this matter relates to a question in which M. Louis has taken no part, and is one with which his veracity has not the slightest connection. That nothing, therefore, is found by Dr. B. to justify his imputation is manifest from its guarded manner, the nature of the premises, and the subject matter which will be soon set forth.

I had certainly some suspicion that Dr. B. would complain of any version I might have attempted of the writings of M. Louis,—especially those on Phthisis and the Typhoid Fever. I therefore took the precaution of adopting his own translations; and this more especially as we are assured by Dr. Bowditch in his Preface to the latter, that he believed he had "translated *truly the meaning* of the author *in every respect*," whilst that on Phthisis had been "revised and altered" by the same hand, and duly registered in the archives of the nation. Having thus determined upon the *safest* course, and stated the fact at page 686, and no objection having been raised against the translation in Europe or America, till now made by the translator himself, it is clearly absurd to suppose that it was incumbent on me to have compared it with the original work, since this would have involved the necessity (on account of the multiplicity of my extracts), of comparing the whole of the four volumes on the typhoid affection. My objector says, "If he had taken the trouble," &c. The task is more difficult than the requisition to perform it, since the principle exacts not one, but an universal comparison. And suppose that others, as Müller, for instance, whom I have quoted largely and critically, should start the same objection; will it be

* New York Journal of Medicine and Surgery, No. 6, Oct. 1840, p. 423.

said that it was my duty to have compared the whole of Baly's translation of 850 compact pages with the original German; and especially when I stated in my work that I should adopt acknowledged translations of foreign authors in preference to any version of my own, that no one might complain of misconstruction. Dr. B., however, having condemned his own translation, renders it proper to inquire how far he may escape under this subterfuge, and especially whether he has made out his principal, but more concealed object.

The reader, by referring to the connection of the foregoing quotation with other remarks by Dr. B., will observe that the imputed attempt to convict M. Louis of "lying" is predicated of the proof by which I thought it expedient to identify M. Louis with the superintendence of the typhoid cases. Since, however, M. Louis no where intimates that he had not the entire charge of these cases (the only ones which I have assigned him), but, on the contrary, everywhere implies that such was the fact, the charge upon which I am arraigned is necessarily a fabrication, and as criminally injurious to M. Louis as unjust to myself. What, then, was the object of Dr. B. in this experiment? Could there have been any other than that of forcibly implying that M. Louis had denied his care of the typhoid patients and that I had endeavored to prove it otherwise? But, a greater consequence is involved, viz., that of impressing the reader with the certainty that M. Louis was not the prescribing man. The question, then, had not the most remote connection with my author's veracity. So unsuspicious, indeed, was I of "attempting to prove M. Louis a liar," I had supposed that I was merely employed in receiving his own testimony that he was responsible for the treatment of the 138 typhoid cases, upon which he erects his generalizations in relation to the typhoid fever. Dr. B. professes not to understand my motives even for this. I will tell him, what the reader, however, who may have seen my Essay, sufficiently comprehends. About the time my work was going to press, in a conversation with one of M. Louis's able disciples, I told him that I considered Louis not only vulnerable as a pathologist, but in his treatment and therapeutical conclusions. The defence was immediately set up, that Chomel was the hospital physician, and consequently alone responsible. I had little doubt, therefore, that Dr. B. would be very likely to resort to the same pretext. Indeed, I have stated this very fact in my Essay (p. 800). "*Hinc illæ lachrymæ.*" In every aspect of the case, however, it should be the pride of his followers to admit, what Louis constantly implies, that he had the active superintendence of the 138 cases, since his "rigorous conclusions," anatomical, pathological, and therapeutical, would be, *prima facie*, seriously impaired without this evidence of their practical foundation.

Still, it is manifest that Dr. B., for divers reasons, is strongly disposed to avail himself of the pretext; by which the reader will perceive that I had not been greatly mistaken in my conclusion, nor unwise in my precautions. Thus, in connection with the quotation which leaves me impeaching the veracity of M. Louis, Dr. B., to give it plausibility, affirms that "there is no such expression in the work on typhoid fever,

as 'I prescribed,' meaning thereby to state definitely that Louis prescribed." It is here that Dr. B. disavows his own translation of an instance which I had cited to the foregoing effect, and one of a very comprehensive nature,—namely, "*we abstained* from bloodletting in the others, either on account of," &c.,—the original being, in this instance, "*On abstint*," &c. Again, a little farther on (p. 448), M. Louis says, or his translator for him,

"We allow generally that a moderate delirium does not require a special and very energetic treatment, and according to the most common practice, *we confined ourselves*, in order to counteract it, to the application of blisters and sinapisms to the lower extremities, in the patients *whose histories* I have compiled."

I have also taken this example on account of its comprehensive import, and have confined myself to Dr. B.'s translation, not only because I originally proceeded upon that principle as the one which I supposed would be most acceptable, but to show that, if the version be not exactly literal, it was rendered otherwise from the conviction of Dr. B. that Louis was the "acting man" in relation to "the patients whose histories he had compiled,"—whilst we have the doctor's affirmation that, in his belief, he "had translated *truly the meaning* of the author *in every respect*."—*(Preface.)*

I am now no farther interested in this question than in carrying out my intention of simply performing an act of justice to Chomel. If this gentleman chooses to take the credit of the 138 typhoid patients,—be it so. The principle, as to the only object of my analysis of the treatment, will be in no respect affected, unless it be to diminish still more the value of my author's therapeutical generalizations. But, till then, I must insist upon the evidence for my conclusion, that the treatment was not only the unqualified basis for doctrines of the highest moment, but was projected by M. Louis himself. This, indeed, is everywhere so apparent from the manner in which M. Louis identifies himself with the history of every case from the time of its admission till its exit, that the fact cannot be doubted till contradicted; and this will never be done by M. Louis, or by any considerate friend, not only for the reason already stated, but as it would imply an attempt to have misled the profession. Take, again, the following examples of the manner in which the translator "*truly*" understood "*the meaning*" of his author. Thus,—"*Our* patient had kept his bed," &c.—(Vol. 1, p. 4.) "*Our* patient was placed," &c.—(P. 6.) "Although *our* patient was placed," &c.—(P. 68.) The work abounds with expressions which appear to denote that Chomel extended his kindness so far to M. Louis as to suffer him to institute his experiments upon these 138 patients. The reader may find the proof on almost every page. I referred specifically to a multitude of instances. Vol. 1st of the translation may be consulted at pages 21, 45, 64, 82, 85, 87, 95, 121, 132, 148, 159, 237, 244, 263, 343; and vol. 2d, at pp. 7, 14, 27, 29, 30, 39, 45, 60, 74, 77, 128, 129, 136, 152, 162, 171, 180, 187, 193, 197, 198, 200, 202, 205, 206, 207, 208, 234, 261, 274, 290, 291, 307, 342, 343, 382, 384, 391, 438, 439, &c. The foregoing references relate gene-

rally to instances which show an intimate connection of the observer with the prescriptions which are announced. I will cite one for the purpose of showing also the *means* of information upon which M. Louis has founded his hypothesis as to the *primary* seat of the typhoid affection in a lesion of the glands of Peyer. After detailing the seven days' symptoms with which the patient had been affected before entering the hospital, M. Louis continues,—"The *patient* assured *me* that he had had a little *delirium*." The same day we read "slight stupor," "*memory seemed* to return to the patient as *I questioned* him," &c. Then follows immediately the prescription. (Vol. 1, p. 342.) *(My Italics.)* No one can take up the work on Typhoid Fever without feeling irresistibly that M. Louis had the active superintendence of the cases which he describes. I cannot find Chomel alluded to beyond the "Advertisement," except in three instances, and then only very incidentally. Nevertheless, I was indifferent to the fact, except so far as I felt disposed to silence prevarication, as will appear from my declaration that,—"this would be *unimportant*, since our author makes the cases entirely his own, erects generalizations upon them, and defends the whole treatment." —(P. 685.) This construction, however, Dr. B. studiously conceals. But his objects, and mine, are now before the reader. My comments upon the treatment, from which I was disposed to separate Chomel, never would have been made in relation to the practice of any man who had not treated the profession as discourteously as I have shown of M. Louis; and had this distinguished individual been less unceremonious, my Essay would either have had no existence, or would have appeared in a different aspect. What I have set forth of his hostility to the profession is urged as a merit by Dr. B. when he says, "Louis, *disgusted* with the uncertainty prevailing *in all* branches of medicine," &c.—(P. 79.) *(My Italics.)* This shows that my strictures were wanted; and if the profession do not find them acceptable, I can only regret that I had attempted so ungracious a service.

The reader will have seen that it was the apparent object of Dr. B. to pervert the foregoing subject so as to extort the charge that I had attempted to "prove M. Louis a liar." So far it was designed to impute to me what I was not attempting; but, a greater object doubtless was to establish the impression more fully, that M. Louis is not responsible for the treatment of the typhoid cases. The secret of this will be found in my comments, and in the death of more than one third of the patients. The solicitude of Dr. B. upon this question may be seen in his hunting the work through to ascertain that there is no such expression in the original as "I prescribed." The whole state of Dr. B.'s mental operations will be farther disclosed by my next exploration.

In connection with the foregoing subject, it is said by Dr. B. that "Chomel, notwithstanding Dr. Paine takes it upon himself to declare to the contrary, is *always the chief physician*."—(P. 79.) This is not only a positive averment, to convict me of untruth, but is intended to carry out the impression, as implied in the statement already examined, that I had attributed the superintendence of the hospital patients, in a general sense, to M. Louis. Should it, however, turn out in

all respects exactly the reverse, Dr. B. must occupy a worse position than he had provided for myself. In the first place, then, I have carefully restricted M. Louis's agency to the 138 typhoid patients; and, secondly, I have stated the very declaration of M. Louis, upon which Dr. B. brings his charge that "Dr. Paine takes it upon himself to declare to the contrary." Thus,—"It should be observed, *in the first place*, that in the 'Advertisement' to the work, Chomel is spoken of as having *the supervision of the hospital*."—(P. 685.) Now, what says the 'Advertisement'? "At that time under the superintendence of M. Chomel;" or, as the translator has it in his new version (and as will appear more fully hereafter), "under the *supervision of* Mons. Chomel." This is every word that appears upon the subject, and, as will be seen by the entire extract in my second number, is noticed by M. Louis in a transient manner. This well-known fact I have no where questioned, and it was stated by me for the very purpose of contradistinguishing the 138 typhoid patients from the general mass, which I had never doubted were under Chomel's exclusive superintendence. And here it is worthy of remark, that Dr. B., in the very midst of this serpentine course, not only allows more than I had contended for, or believed to be true, but contradicts the whole of his statement, in saying that M. Louis "gave up his business, and entered as *clinical aid* to his friend Chomel." Again, the same thing is implied in the following sentence,—"but it remains for Dr. Paine to find out that Chomel ought to be ashamed of his *co-laborer*," &c.—(Pp. 76, 79.)

Finally, the work on Typhoid Fever was designed to unsettle the most important principles in physiology, pathology, and therapeutics; and, not being otherwise stated, it is inferable, *à priori*, that this vast enterprise had the advantage of the fundamental requisite,—that is to say, the author's personal superintendence of the 138 cases of the typhoid disease. I need not inform my reader, that it is not unusual in French hospitals for the chief physician to delegate a certain class of patients to other physicians for the work of experiment. This fact, and its consequences, I had occasion to illustrate, by example, in my "Commentaries."—(*See Vol.* 1, *p.* 305.) I may say, however, that, as in my Essay on the writings of M. Louis, I had in view no partial objects, but principles co-extensive with the importance of the healing art.

I have dwelt long, perhaps tediously, upon the foregoing implications; but they had been sedulously involved, and put forth with a commanding confidence. A full analysis has been therefore indispensable, not only to develope the motives and deportment of Dr. B., but to place my relations to M. Louis, as a commentator, in their proper aspect. Nor can I yet conclude, without admonishing the reader that something yet remains to illustrate the *quo animo* of my critic in respect to the present subject, and by which it will appear that, through a fraudulent translation and surreptitious quotations, designed to pervert the truth in other respects, he simultaneously enforces the belief that M. Louis was not only intimately concerned with all the cases of every disease to which he refers in his work on the typhoid affection, but, in so doing, imputes to that work a foundation which has no apparent existence. The state-

ments and allegations are ingeniously conceived, and artfully involved. They require, therefore, a more or less elaborate examination. There is no one which is not essentially destitute of truth, and they are generally distinguished for a combined purpose of impugning my honesty or veracity, of misrepresenting my work, and of misleading the profession as to M. Louis's labors and doctrines. It is true, that in certain instances I am allowed the alternative of having read my author carelessly or not at all. But this is no part of the character of my work; and, whilst I am not ambitious of the indulgence, its sincerity is contradicted by the ample evidence in my Essay that I had not only read my author repeatedly, but with careful attention. The critical press, also, which has been thus stealthily invaded, requires redress; and I cannot but think, therefore, where so many wrongs are committed, the public must feel an interest in their proper exposure. I lament the necessity of employing any language that may be offensive to a chastened taste; but, vulgarity may not always be rebuked by forbearance, and there are transgressions which are better described by their right names, than by any circumlocution.

HOMŒOPATHY—DR. LEE, &c.

To the Editor of the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal.

Sir,—No one who has inquired into the merits of the doctrine called Homœopathy, with the candor and diligence which the subject demands, can read with any degree of complacency the communication of your correspondent Dr. Lee, of New York, as given in your Journal of the 14th inst.

Dr. L. expresses some alarm lest the memory of his brother-in-law, the late worthy and highly esteemed Dr. Caleb Ticknor, should suffer from the single remark made by you in your obituary notice of that much-lamented physician, that "Dr. Ticknor had become a thorough convert to Hahnemannism from an honest conviction that it was a rational system." Yet, Sir, I cannot but think that if Dr. Lee meant to convey the idea that he wrote *purely* and *solely* to defend the character of his deceased friend, he has been very unfortunate in the attempt, since any such conviction, on the part of the candid and intelligent reader of his letter, must be prevented by the manner in which he speaks of the doctrine above mentioned.

Why does Dr. L. attach so much importance to the almost unmeaning play upon the words Homœopathy and Hahnemannism? When you used the latter in your very respectful notice of your friend, did you not consider it as synonymous with the former? Are not the terms Homœopathy and Hahnemannism so used, and have they not been so used altogether, until very lately? Does not your correspondent know that a pretended distinction in these terms has but recently been used? And can he suppose that honest homœopathists are not fully aware of the object for which this pretended distinction is got up? If he can, he must be as much wanting in a knowledge of mankind, as he has set

himself forth to be, in his brief epistle, of the *true* and *whole doctrine* of Homœopathy or Hahnemannism.

The whole doctrine is brief enough to need no division. It teaches that in selecting the remedies for the treatment of a disease, the fundamental principle or natural therapeutic law, *similia similibus curantur*, should be observed; and that in the use of the remedies, only so much should be given (though it be but the millionth of a grain or less) as will produce the least possible exacerbation of the disease, but still sufficient to hasten the diminution of the morbid phenomena, or dispel them entirely. This is Homœopathy—this is Hahnemannism. Hahnemann was the first who taught that these principles should be a general guide in the treatment of disease, and that they were universally applicable; though he claims not to be the first that had a glimpse of the former, which he considers as the natural therapeutic law. And he has performed more than ten times the labor to show that it had been faintly seen, partially acted upon, stated, and lost sight of by his predecessors, than has been done by all the opponents of the new system united.

He who should observe the law, *similia similibus curantur*, and still give his remedies in ounces and drachms, would not be a *homœopathic practitioner* in the full, legitimate and common acceptation of the name. Nor would the physician who, rejecting the fundamental principle of homœopathy, should give the infinitesimal doses, deserve to be called a *Hahnemannist*.

Dr. Ticknor's pamphlet remains to tell how far he had become a convert to the new doctrine, and will doubtless be well understood without a commentary from his survivors. Homœopathists had not been anxious to claim him as one of their number, though they were happy to hail one possessed of such talents and industry, on his very entrance to the work of examining their favorite doctrine and testing the new principles on which it is founded.

Dr. Lee, after admitting that Dr. Ticknor "had been led to believe that the fundamental principle of homœopathy was of vastly greater importance, and of more extensive application, than is generally believed," adds, "he never maintained, with homœopathists, that *the half is greater than the whole*, and that the millionth of a grain of medicine had more power than the whole grain."

There seems to be involved in this insinuation, a truth which the writer did not intend to express, for if Dr. Ticknor had maintained such propositions, he must have done so alone, and not "*with homœopathists*," as there is nothing in their doctrines which bears the slightest resemblance to such; and this, Dr. Lee, if he *understands* anything of them, must know to be the truth. How this insinuation of his, therefore, must be viewed by those who *do know* what homœopathic doctrines are, he may not be at a loss to infer.

He says Dr. Ticknor "utterly discarded the infinitesimal doses," and that "he also unhesitatingly set aside all evidence in favor of the efficacy of such doses." If this be true, it is not at all surprising that it should be the case with Dr. T. at the mere outset of his inquiry into homœopathy. And it would merely show that he had not allowed him-

self to experiment with and test the power of "the little doses," and that he was not yet fairly in the right path. If he had faithfully pursued the only just course, by which he could have come the most speedily to a fair and honest conclusion, he would in the event (and that in a very short time) have had to "set aside the evidence" of his own senses, or admit "the efficacy of infinitesimal doses." The history of homœopathy fully warrants this assertion.

It is stated, also, by your correspondent, that Dr. Ticknor used the "ordinary medicine of the shops, and when he gave homœopathic medicines, he employed the saturated tinctures in appreciable doses." And what of this? It is only another evidence that Dr. T. was not fairly inquiring into the validity of homœopathic practice as taught by Hahnemann and his disciples.

What Dr. Lee's idea is, of an "appreciable" dose, he does not state—perhaps it is, that it should be one which is manifested to our senses by its size, weight, color and odor; but according to Dr. Ticknor's idea, it is one which is "sufficient to make the system feel it." An individual, then, who is made to faint by the odor of musk, otto of rose, cheese, or strawberries, takes an "appreciable dose;" yet who will deny that it must be an infinitesimal one? The person who suffers from smallpox in consequence of respiring a few times in the atmosphere which surrounds one infected with this disease, or one who has intermittent fever from passing a stagnant pool, or a violent cutaneous inflammation from remaining a few moments on the leeward side of a poisonous plant, or who from vaccination has high febrile excitement and a sore and stiffened arm, &c., takes an "appreciable dose;" yet who can say that in either case, even the latter, it is more than the millionth of a grain?

In his final charge against homœopathy, Dr. Lee says, Hahnemann taught "that the billionth of a grain of medicine has more efficacy than a pound, and that his disciples believe it." And this he states without a blush. The disciples of Hahnemann would doubtless like to know from one who has obtained such clear views of the true doctrine of homœopathy, where in his writings such teaching is to be found, and where among his followers he can point to such believers; for until this can be done, they will view such a statement, from any one, as a gratuitous misrepresentation. Respectfully yours, &c. H.

CONGENITAL CATARACT—OPERATION.

[Communicated for the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal.]

Daniel B. Leavitt, aged 32 months, was brought into the Infirmary* on the 9th of June, with congenital cataract of both eyes. The child was in good health, with no disposition to inflammation. It was decided to perform the operation of division of the capsule.

A solution of belladonna was applied to the eye at ½ past 12. At 3, P. M., the pupil was sufficiently dilated, and the operation was performed on the left eye with a *fine cambric needle* passed through the cornea a little

* Opened November, 1839, for the Treatment of Diseases of the Eye and Ear.

more than a line from the sclerotica, and making three or four cuts in the capsule. Very little after treatment was necessary; no application was made to the eye—not even a shade. The child was permitted to be about his play as usual, and was carried home on the fourth day from the operation. In five weeks the opacity was entirely removed, and the child seeing well.

The success of the operation on this eye was so complete it was thought advisable to operate on the other. The child was accordingly returned on the 16th of July, and the operation performed on the right eye in the same manner as on the first.

17th. Child restless. Considerable inflammation, and disposed to avoid the light. Prescribed a cathartic; warm bath to the eye, and exclusion of light.

18th. Inflammation, restlessness and fever increased. The child lies on his face so as entirely to exclude the light. Four leeches applied to the temple, baths continued, and solution of antimony given.

19th. All the symptoms have yielded, and the child comfortable and playful. 22d. Carried home. 27th. No inflammation; absorption has commenced; avoids strong light, or shades the eye last operated on, with his hands, when exposed to it.

Oct 9th. The operation has been perfectly successful on both eyes, and the child sees well, with the exception of some indistinctness occasioned by the remaining uncontrollable motion of the eyes.

The only difficulty encountered in the operation was the *extreme mobility* of the eye, which could not be controlled until it was entered and fixed by the needle. The operation on both eyes should be performed at the same time.

JOSIAH CROSBY.

Meredith Bridge, N. H., Oct. 17, 1840.

BOSTON MEDICAL AND SURGICAL JOURNAL.

BOSTON, OCTOBER 28, 1840.

HISTORY OF EMALMING.*

WHATEVER relates to the supposed lost art of preserving the bodies of men and animals through a succession of ages, cannot be otherwise than interesting to the scientific reader. History throws but little light on the process—and although the mummies of Egypt are common in the cabinets of the curious, neither the time of their death, the age of the world in which they lived, or the composition by which their mortal remains have resisted the destructive influences of time through many centuries, has yet been satisfactorily explained. However, M. Gannal, the author of a work that has excited an uncommon degree of interest in France, has succeeded wonderfully, not only in collecting the scattered historical

* History of Embalming, and of preparations in anatomy, pathology and natural history, including an account of a new process for embalming. By J. N. Gannal. Paris: 1838. Translated from the French, with notes and additions, by R. Harlan, M.D. Philadelphia: J. Dobson. Pp. 264. 1840.

memoranda of the ancients on this subject, but has superadded important discoveries of his own. Dr. Harlan, of Philadelphia, whilst residing abroad, took particular pains to examine into the merits of our author's processes, with regard to their subserving the pursuits of science, and the results were so entirely convincing, that he has both translated and enriched it with suitable and appropriate observations of his own.

This translation forms an octavo of 264 pages, neatly bound in boards, and, together with its numerous additions, may now be purchased at a price much less than the original could be imported from Paris. M. Gannal's process for preserving anatomical preparations—the essential, and in fact the all-important feature of the book—has already been introduced into the great anatomical schools of Paris. The Montoyon prize was awarded to the indefatigable experimenter by the Royal Institute, and he was equally complimented by the Royal Academy of Medicine. These circumstances show in what estimation M. Gannal's labors are held by his own countrymen. Of Dr. Harlan, as a profound naturalist, his name is known wherever the liberal sciences are cultivated. In this work he has conferred a favor—nay, he has rendered a special service to the medical and other institutions of the United States in which museums exist. As remarked last week, to medical students it seems to be almost an indispensable assistant, inasmuch as it informs us how to preserve the specimens which we have prepared, against the inroads of vermin, the atmosphere, and all the ordinary causes of destruction to which they are exposed in the progress of years.

Dissertation on Diseases of the Teeth.—Twelve gentlemen, distinguished for their attainments in the science of dentistry, were appointed by the recently-formed society, of which they are prominent members, to write dissertations on the following subjects, for the benefit of the profession: viz., on the best method of saving the natural teeth; on ulcerated fangs, and the methods of cure; on the necessity of stopping carious teeth; on the ligamentum dentis; on the necessity of regulating the natural teeth; on the extraction of diseased teeth; on diseases of the gums; on deciduous teeth; on salivary calculus; on the propriety of filling the teeth; and, lastly, on the toothache.

Physicians will be as glad to possess these discourses as the most enthusiastic dentist; and we cannot feel otherwise than solicitous to have them extensively circulated as a distinct work, instead of being confined to the pages of the Dental Journal. Let every person who has defective teeth have an opportunity of reading the opinions of the best operators in the land.

Maryland Medical and Surgical Journal.—No. 3, an unexceptionable number so far as it regards the character of its papers, though late, has finally reached us. The neatness of the Journal alone, is a recommendation. Reports of cases by Drs. Lawrason, U. S. N.; Barbee, Cincinnati; Jameson, Baltimore; Welch, Annapolis; &c., together with contributions to pathology, by Dr. Power, are particularly recommended to the notice of medical readers. The review of Dr. Gross's Elements of Pathological Anatomy, is a candid production: the author is evidently favorably impressed, but like an honest man endeavors to show how the work may be improved.

Homœopathic Examiner.—The visit of the editor (Dr. Hull) to the far-famed Dr. Hahnemann, now nearly 90 years old, and his young wife, who "*adores him,*" is decidedly an interesting article. We have always liked the Examiner—as a literary work, and we also like Dr. Hull's earnestness of manner and devotedness to what he considers medical truth. It seems that Dr. Hahnemann considers Dr. Hering, of Philadelphia, one of his most efficient disciples. He appears to have no knowledge of a legion who hail from his banner in the city of New York and in other places in neighboring States. The Examiner, in point of typographical finish, is not surpassed by any periodical now published.

Danish Medical Publications.—From Dr. Otto, a professor in the University of Copenhagen, we have received, the past week, *Pharmacopœa Danica*, published the present year, an octavo of 316 pages, admirably printed. Also, *Bibliothek fur Læger*, for Oct. and Nov., 1839, edited by Dr. Otto. Also, *De Strabismo*, &c., a dissertation by N. G. Melchior. De viribus et rationibus maiorum dosium Colomellis, by C. J. Æ. Hornemann. *De chemicis Calculorum vesicariorum rationibus*, scripsit E. A. Scharling. This last work is a quarto pamphlet, of 52 pages only, illustrated by six beautifully colored plates, on which are figured fifty-one different forms of the stone. Each and all of these new publications are at the service of our medical neighbors, provided they are punctually returned. Medical authors in the United States, who may wish to exchange their own works for those of other countries, can send and receive packages through the editor of this Journal with as much facility as in any other way. The expense attending the transmission of scientific books through foreign custom houses, is quite small, and cannot therefore be any objection to maintaining a correspondence with the learned of the old world.

Fatty Liver.—Fatty liver is most frequently observed in persons who have died from scrofulous tubercles in the lungs; in those, says Andral, in whom the blood has not been sufficiently arterialized, and in whom the pulmonary exhalation is greatly diminished. Can it be, he inquires, from the absence of the due separation of hydrogen from the lungs that this compound of hydrogen, fat, becomes deposited in the parenchyma of the liver? This question is well deserving the attention of pathologists, and its solution might lead to important information. The disease has also been observed in some cancerous disorders and in dartrous diseases of the skin.—*Cyclopædia of Anatomy and Physiology.*

Apothecaries in Russia.—But, in this analysis of the more respectable part of the population of a Russian town, we have omitted one conspicuous person—the apothecary. He is always among the wealthiest in the place. None can sell drugs without a patent; and as only one or two in a provincial town, willing to gain their bread in this way, have influence enough to obtain the emperor's permission, there is but little opposition in the trade. Nothing is paid for the patent, so that the free profits of such a business are often very large. A German, whose daughter is married to the second apothecary of a government town near this (Koursk), told us that he had seen his son-in-law's books, and seldom found the pro-

fits less than 32,000 rubles (or more than £1,200) a year; while the first apothecary, as our informant asserted, draws 50,000 rubles, or £2000 a year. He instanced a smaller town, in which the two dealers in physic draw 15,000 and 25,000 rubles respectively. There are other parts of the continent where apothecaries are equally wealthy; as in the German towns, where they are always among the richest citizens.—*Bremner's Excursions in the Interior of Russia.*

To Correspondents.—An account of the surgical operations referred to by a correspondent in New Hampshire will be thankfully received. We shall also hold him to his promise of an account of a "successful operation for the cure of squinting—so soon as a subject can be procured."

Married,—In Newbury, Elbridge G. Kelley, M.D., to Miss Hannah P. Rand. —In Lynchburg, Va., Dr. Robert Early to Miss Harriet Davies.

Died,—At Pittsfield, Mass., on Friday last, David Palmer, M.D., of Woodstock, Vt., a professor in the Berkshire Medical Institution. The shocking accident by which this valuable man lost his life, was narrated in the last No. of the Journal. A memoir of Dr. Palmer is due the profession from some of his many friends. —At Berkley, Penn., Dr. Abner Thomas, 58.—In Baltimore Co., Md., Dr. William Dows, 30, formerly of Massachusetts.

Number of deaths in Boston for the week ending Oct. 24, 34.—Males, 22—females, 12. Stillborn, 1.
Of consumption, 5—inflammation of the stomach, 1—marasmus, 1—croup, 3—hooping cough, 4—tumor, 1—lung fever, 2—dysentery, 2—sudden, 1—teething, 1—scarlet fever, 2—casualty, 1—cholera infantum, 1—apoplexy, 2—infantile, 1—typhous fever, 1—drowned, 1—diarrhœa, 1—delirium tremens, 1—inflammation of the lungs, 1.

DR. J. J. MOORMAN,

RESIDENT PHYSICIAN AT THE WHITE SULPHUR SPRINGS, VA.

May be consulted by persons at a distance, as to the propriety of using the *White Sulphur Water*, in particular diseases, &c. Communications, descriptive of the case, enclosing the ordinary fee of $5, directed, post-paid, to Dr. M. at the White Sulphur Springs, Va., will be promptly responded to.
October 23d, 1840. O. 29—1amMcheoptO

MEDICAL INSTRUCTION.

The subscribers have associated themselves for the purpose of receiving students of medicine.
Students will have access to a good Medical Library, a collection of anatomical preparations and plates, and will have abundant opportunities of seeing practice.
They will also be examined once a week on Theory and Practice of Medicine and Obstetrics, by Dr. Wheaton.
And on Anatomy, Surgery and Materia Medica, by Dr. Rivers.
A comfortable office for study, with fire and lights, will be provided.
The fee will be $75 per annum, payable semi-annually in advance.

LEVI WHEATON, M.D.
Providence, July 11, 1840. A 5—5t* H. W. RIVERS, M.D.

JEFFERSON MEDICAL COLLEGE OF PHILADELPHIA.

The regular Lectures will commence on the first Monday of November.
The following are the professors, in the order of their appointment:—

1. Jacob Green, M.D., Chemistry.
2. Granville S. Pattison, M.D., Anatomy.
3. John Revere, M.D., Practice of Medicine.
4. Robley Dunglison, M.D., Institutes of Medicine and Materia Medica.
5. Robert M. Huston, M.D., Obstetrics and Diseases of Women and Children.
6. Joseph Pancoast, M.D., Surgery.

On and after the 1st of October the dissecting rooms will be kept open, and the Professor of Anatomy will give his personal attendance thereto. Lectures will likewise be delivered regularly during the month on various branches, and opportunities for clinical instruction will be afforded at the Philadelphia Hospital under the Professors of Institutes of Medicine and Surgery; and at the Dispensary of the College under the Professors of Physic and Surgery. JOHN REVERE, M.D.,
Philadelphia, July 15, 1840. A. 26.—tN1 *Dean of the Faculty.*

ABDOMINAL SUPPORTERS.

Dr. Haynes's instrument, which is recommended by the profession generally, may now be had at the Medical Journal office. Price, with perineal strap, only $4—without, $3,50. By addressing the publisher, No. 184 Washington street, physicians may be readily accommodated. A 19

COLUMBIAN COLLEGE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

THE Lectures in the Medical Department of this Institution will commence on the first Monday in November, annually, and continue until the 1st of March.

During this period, full courses will be delivered on the various branches of medicine by

THOMAS SEWALL, M.D., Professor of Pathology, and the Practice of Medicine.
FREDERICK HALL, M.D., Professor of Chemistry and Pharmacy.
HARVEY LINDLEY, M.D., Professor of Obstetrics, and the Diseases of Women and Children.
THOMAS MILLER, M.D., Professor of Anatomy and Physiology.
JOHN M. THOMAS, M.D., Professor of Materia Medica and Therapeutics.
J. FREDERICK MAY, M.D., Professor of Surgery; late Professor of Surgery in the University of Maryland.
SAMUEL C. SHOOT, M.D., Demonstrator of Anatomy.

The Medical College is situated at the corner of 10th and E streets, equi-distant from the Capitol and the President's house.

In the arrangement of this building, and the organization of the school, particular reference has been had to the study of *Practical Anatomy*, a branch which the student will enjoy peculiar facilities for cultivating.

The Professor of Surgery will show all the operations upon the recent subject, *and afford the student an opportunity of repeating the more important ones with his own hand.*

The Professor of Chemistry has a complete chemical and philosophical apparatus.

The Professor of Obstetrics will illustrate his lectures by obstetrical apparatus, and an ample collection of preparations and drawings.

As there are many young men of talent and worth in different parts of our country who, from restricted circumstances, are unable to avail themselves of the benefit of public lectures, the Professors have resolved to admit, gratuitously, two such students from each of the States, and one from each of the Territories. In order, however, to guard against individuals whose education and character do not qualify them to become useful members of the profession, the selection is placed in the hands of the Senators and Delegates of Congress, each of whom has the right to select one student from his respective State or Territory, and whose certificate of selection will be a passport to all the lectures, by paying only, on entering the school, the usual matriculating fee of five dollars.

The entire expense, for a Course of Lectures by all the Professors, is $70. Dissecting Ticket, $10; optional with the student

The requisites for graduation are, that the candidate shall have attended the lectures of each professor two full courses, or one full course in this school, and one in some other respectable institution. He shall have entered his name with the Dean of the Faculty as a candidate for graduation, and delivered to him an inaugural dissertation on some medical subject, thirty days before the close of the session, and pass a satisfactory examination.

All persons who have attended two full courses of lectures in this school, are entitled to attend succeeding courses free of expense.

The degrees are conferred by the authority of the Columbian College, incorporated by an act of Congress of the United States.

Good board can be procured at from three to four dollars per week. J. M. THOMAS, M.D.
City of Washington, June 2, 1840. *Dean of the Faculty.*

MEDICAL LECTURES IN BOSTON.

THE Medical Faculty of Harvard University will begin their annual course of Lectures on the first Wednesday of November next, at the Massachusetts Medical College, Mason street, Boston. The Introductory Lecture will be given at 12 o'clock, M., in the Anatomical Theatre, on that day, and the lectures will continue four months.

Anatomy and the Operations in Surgery, by	Prof. WARREN.
Midwifery and Medical Jurisprudence, by	Prof. CHANNING.
Materia Medica and Clinical Medicine, by	Prof. BIGELOW.
Principles of Surgery and Clinical Surgery, by	Prof. HAYWARD.
Chemistry, by	Prof. WEBSTER.
Theory and Practice of Physic, by	Prof. WARE.

The students will have an opportunity of attending the medical and surgical practice at the Massachusetts General Hospital, and also of seeing the surgical operations performed there during the winter.

The Faculty have reason to believe that the provisions of the law legalizing the study of anatomy, will be carried more completely into operation than has heretofore been done, and that the facilities for practical anatomy will consequently be much increased. WALTER CHANNING, *Dean.*

Boston, July 6, 1840. Jy 15—1N1

LECTURES ON HERNIA AND MECHANICAL SURGERY.

ON Tuesday evening the 9th of November, at 7 o'clock, Dr. Chase will commence his Winter Course of Lectures on Hernia and analogous diseases, combined with Mechanical Surgery, as applied to the *correction of distortions.*

The relief of the various *curvatures of the spine, deformities of the limbs, and club-foot*, will be discussed.

The Lectures will be delivered in the lecture-room at his private residence, on Tuesday and Friday of each week, at 7 o'clock, P. M., and will continue three months.

The course will be purely *clinical*, as in every instance patients will be present affected with the disease or deformity under consideration, and the student will have an opportunity of becoming practically acquainted with the use of all the instruments employed in the treatment of these diseases.

Ticket *five dollars.* HEBER CHASE, M.D.,
Philadelphia, Sept., 1840. O. 14—1m *Ninth street, below Walnut.*

THE BOSTON MEDICAL AND SURGICAL JOURNAL is published every Wednesday, by D. CLAPP, JR., at 184 Washington St., corner of Franklin St., to whom all communications must be addressed, post paid. It is also published in Monthly Parts, with a printed cover. There are two volumes each year. J. V. C. SMITH, M.D., Editor. Price $3,00 a year in advance, $3,50 after three months, or $4,00 if not paid within the year. Two copies to the same address, for $5,00 a year, in advance. Orders from a distance must be accompanied by payment in advance or satisfactory reference. Postage the same as for a newspaper.